

Remarks

Reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 11-12, 22-24, 27-28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Riesop Patent WO99/24638 (i.e., corresponding US 6,537,387, hereinafter Riesop) in view of Murphy US 5,391,234 (hereinafter Murphy). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Riesop applies a manganese phosphate coating to protect zinc coated steel strips. (Column 2, lines 1-7.) Optionally, Riesop adds hexafluorotitanate anions. Manganese phosphating is known in the art as Parkerizing. Those skilled in the art know this to be an application of an electrochemical phosphate conversion coating. The Examiner correctly points out that Riesop does not disclose stripping the corrosion protection layer. Murphy discloses applying an aqueous stripping solution for “loosening decorative or protective films from a surface such as acrylic, epoxy, vinyl and/or alkyd resin coating components.” (Column 4, lines 25-29.) Such coatings are base coat or clear coat paints. (Column 1, lines 20-22 and Column 9, lines 15-17.) Murphy does not teach or suggest a composition for stripping an electrochemically applied temporary coating. The only teaching of such comes from Applicants own disclosure. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection based on the combination of Riesop and Murphy is improper. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 22, and 27 as they each claim removing a primary passivating coating comprising phosphate and fluorometalate ions.

Claims 2-7, 11, and 12 depend from claim 1, claims 23-24 depend from claim 22, and claims 28 and 30 depend from claim 27, and are therefore patentable at least for the same reasons as claims 1, 22, and 27, respectively. In addition, claims 2-7, 11, 12, 23-24, 28, and 30 each add limitations rendering them separately patentable.

Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riesop in view of Murphy and further in view of Torok et al. US 4,287,008 (hereinafter Torok). As noted above, Applicants submit that combination of Riesop in view of Murphy is not a proper combination. Even if the combination were proper Torok describes a coated ferrous product produced by continuous hot-dipped coating of steel strip. In claims 8 and 9 Applicants claim a galvanic coating. Torok does not describe a galvanic coating. In particular, Torok teaches away from galvanized coatings stating that a hot-dip coating offers many of the advantages of the essentially single phase coating such as zinc (galvanized) and aluminum (aluminized) without the disadvantages associated with such single phase coatings” (column 3, lines 32-36). Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection regarding claims 8 and 9.

Claims 25-26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riesop in view of Murphy and further in view of Lindert et al. US 4,970,264 (hereinafter Lindert). Applicants submit that it is improper to combine Riesop with Murphy as noted above. Lindert does not remedy the deficiencies of Murphy in that Lindert does not describe removing the primary passivating coating from the metal surface or conversion coating the metal surface. Claims 25-26 depend from claim 22 and, therefore, are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 25-26 provide additional limitations that render these claims additionally patentable.

Claim 29 depends from claim 27 and is therefore patentable at least for the same reasons as claim 27. Claim 29 introduces additional limitations that render it patentable independently.

Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection regarding claims 25-26, and 29.

Applicants have made a genuine effort to respond to each of the Examiner's rejections in advancing the prosecution of this case. Applicants believe that all formal and substantive requirements for patentability have been met and that this case is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. If any additional issues need to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at his earliest convenience.

Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

JASDEEP SOHI et al.

By /Michael S. Brodbine/
Michael S. Brodbine
Reg. No. 38,392
Attorney for Applicants

Date: July 3, 2007

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351